

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. This Amendment should be entered under Rule 116 because it places this application in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-13 remain pending in the application.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being neither directed to a process or to a machine. In response, claim 5 has been amended to more clearly recite process steps thereby overcoming the §101 rejection. The amendment to claim 5 is supported at page 2, lines 21-26 of the Specification as originally filed. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hayes-Roth. (US 20030028498) Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons as below.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's reasoning of the rejection. As Applicants reiterated, the architecture, as disclosed in Hayes-Roth, is a well-known three-tier architecture. This three tier architecture does not include a "computing layer" as recited in claim 1. The three-tier architecture as disclosed by Hayes-Roth is merely a self-contained computer that is employed on the client side, as well as on the sever side (See paragraph [132] to [138 and [139] to [142]).

In addition, nowhere does Hayes-Roth disclose "creating a container" as recited in claim 1.

Thus, Hayes-Roth fails to disclose all of the limitations recited in claim 1, in particular, creating a container in which is stored at least one of the following representations of interaction context: representation of the terminals that can be used by users of the system, representations of modes of action, representation of the modes of perception of exchanges of information by the users, representation of activity of the users, representation of context, representation of services expected. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 and 7-11 recite additional, important limitations and should be patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 as well as on their own merits.

Independent claim 5 recites similar limitations as claim 1. Thus, claim 5 should be patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 as well as on its own merits.

Claims 6, 12 and 13 recite additional, important limitations and should be patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 5 as well as on their own merits.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: March 13, 2008
KMB/SY/ser